

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable by Sampson et. al. (US Pat. No. 6,490,624). Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action. The present Response is intended to be fully responsive to the rejections raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The claimed Invention

The pending claims 1-26, of which claims 1, 8, 13, 18, and 22 are independent, all include claim elements relating to determining if a communications session is either on hold or in suspension. For example, representative claim 1 states “determining whether the first communications session is put on hold”, and claim 18 includes the element “responsive to detecting that a first communication session associated with the mobile node is suspended.” Further, the independent claims all include elements relating to detection of a second communications session to be connected or use of a signaling message to determine a session to be connected. For example, representative claim 1 states “detecting a second communications session to be connected to the client device” and claim 8 states “sending a signaling message to the mobile terminal indicating a second communications session to be connected to the mobile terminal”.

The Sampson Reference

The Sampson reference describes a system and method for, *inter alia*, managing sessions between clients and servers. Various embodiments described therein include determining if a client is part of a valid session based on a session identifier (Sampson, col. 3, lines 22-28). A user logs in to a system having protected resources and, if authenticated, a session is created for the user in the Session Manager (Sampson, col. 4, lines 45-52). A session can be monitored to ensure a client contacts a server managed by the session manager within a specified period of time. (Sampson, col. 3, lines 29-42). The session manager will only allow access to resources when the client is part of a valid, un-revoked session. (Sampson, col. 3, lines 41-48). The Sampson reference also describes synchronization between a plurality

of session managers and ensuring servers are bound to session managers via a topology management element. (Sampson, col. 3, line 49 – col. 4, line 44).

As disclosed by Sampson, a session may be purged if the session has expired or the client has failed to contact a server. (Sampson, col. 14, lines 43-67). Signals sent through the various networks carrying data to and from a computer system managing may be carried via the Internet. (Sampson, col. 17, lines 29-30, and col. 18, lines 31-44).

Response to § 102 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sampson. The Examiner cited two sections of Sampson to support the rejection of claim elements involving determining if a communications session is on hold: (1) col. 14, lines 43-67 and (2) col. 18, lines 31-44. As described above, the cited paragraphs in fact describe (1) purging sessions that had expired or from a client who had failed to contact a server and (2) the use of the Internet to carry signals to and from a computer managing sessions. However, these sections do not disclose detection of a communications session to be connected to the client device or determining if a communications session is put on hold.

The Sampson reference cited by the Examiner does not disclose various elements of the claimed invention. In particular, Sampson does not appear to disclose at least the detection of a communications session to be connected or use of a signaling message to indicate a session is to be connected. Nor does it disclose the step of making a determination that a communications session is on hold. Applicants have reviewed the remaining portions of Sampson and have not located any suggestion or motivation of a determination if a communications session is on hold. Applicants respectfully submit that the objection is traversed, and the claims are allowable.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants submit that the application is in good and proper form for allowance and respectfully request the Examiner to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney, at 312-913-3305.

Respectfully submitted,

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

September 11, 2006

By: /Robert J. Irvine III/
Robert J. Irvine III
Registration No. 41,865